Different operational meanings of continuous variable Gaussian entanglement criteria and Bell inequalities

D. Buono,[1] G. Nocerino,[2] S. Solimeno,[3] and A. Porzio[4]

[1] *Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale, Università degli Studi di Salerno, via Giovanni Paolo II, I-84084 Fisciano (SA), Italy*

[2] *Trenitalia spa, DPR Campania, Ufficio di Ingegneria della Manutenzione, IMC Campi Flegrei, Via Diocleziano 255, 80124 Napoli, Italy*

[3] *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università "Federico II", Complesso Universitario Monte Sant'Angelo, I-80126 Napoli, Italy*

[4] *CNR – SPIN, Unità di Napoli, Complesso Universitario Monte Sant'Angelo, I-80126 Napoli, Italy*

Entanglement, one of the most intriguing aspects of quantum mechanics, marks itself into different features of quantum states. For this reason different criteria can be used for verifying entanglement. In this paper we review some of the entanglement criteria casted for continuous variable states and link them to peculiar aspects of the original debate on the famous EPR paradox. Moreover, we give a handy expression for valuating Bell–type non–locality on Gaussian states. We also present the experimental measurement of a particular realization of the Bell operator over continuous variable entangled states produced by a sub–threshold type–II OPO.

arXiv:1407.3965v1 [quant-ph] 15 Jul 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the first reply by Schrödinger [1] to the famous EPR paper [2] the word "entanglement" has been primarly used for indicating a class of quantum states that shows non–local features. Discussing the dynamical properties of a composite system made of two subsystems that, after mutual interaction, move away one from the other Einstein Podolsy and Rosen concluded that quantum mechanics was not-complete and that some more local (hidden) dynamical variables would have been necessary for a correct description of the physical reality. Essentially, they pointed to two quantum–mechanical aspects that they found counter–intuitive. In primis, the possible ambiguity of the wave function so that "... as a consequence of two different measurements performed upon the first system, the second system may be left in states with two different wave functions ... ". The second aspect was later indicated, by Einstein itself, as a *spooky action at distance* "...since at the time of measurement the two systems no longer interact, no real change can take place in the second system in consequence of anything that may be done to the first system ... ". We nowadays know that they were wrong and that quantum mechanics gives, so far, a complete representation of this strange phenomenon.

Up to the late fifties of last century the debate on entanglement was mostly confined to the fundamental aspect of quantum mechanics and the word itself hadn't any particular operational meaning. In 1957 a paper by Bohm and Aharonov [3] moved the focus from the original *Gedankenexperiment* toward more feasible and intuitive physical implementations and, in particular, to spin–like systems. This paved the way to a more complete theoretical analysis of the hidden variables scenario that leads to the famous Bell inequalities[**?**][4] for dichotomic quantum variables. This made spin–like systems the preferential candidates for proving the failure of any hidden variables hyphotesis. Single photons have been then widely used in several experimental tests of the Bell inequalities (see for a review Ref. [6]). Very recently, a novel experiment made the photon the first physical system for which each of the main loopholes has been closed [7].

On the other hand, the original formulation of the EPR paradox was based on continuous variable systems. So that, in 1986 Reid and Walls proposed the first translation of Bell inequalities into the continuous varaible language [8] and in 1992 the first experimental realization of an EPR–like system appeared [9]. Since then, a few more attempts have been carried out for translating the Bell argument into the language of continuous variables (CV) [10]. Among them the one proposed by Banaszek and Wódkiewicz [11] considers the relation between the Wigner function of the state and non–locality.

Entanglement, in its orignal formulation, states the existence of global states of a composite system which cannot be written as a product of states of individual subsystems. While this definition set an univoque border between separable and entangled states, entanglement gives rise to different features of quantum systems and can be seen under different perspectives [12]. On one hand, mathematically defining entanglement as a property of the composite system wavefunction, make it intrinsically related to pure states [13]. On the other hand, we all know that experimentally acessible states are mixed, so that feasible entanglement tests have to be related to density matrices rather than wave functions [14].

In this paper we aim at discussing the operational meanings of different criteria usually employed for assessing CV entanglement. In particular, we will link each of them to different facets of the original entanglement debate. We will apply them to entangled Gaussian states (GS) [15, 16] produced by a type–II sub–threshold frequency degenerate OPO. By experimentally analysing the properties of experimentally generated CV entangled states we will express all these criteria in terms of the

covariance matrix elements. Moreover, we give a novel handy relation that describes in a simple way the connection among entanglement, purity and Bell's non-locality. The experimental analysis prove that some entanglement features are strongly hold against decoherence while Bell inequality is violated only for nearly pure states.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sect. II the properties of Guassian states are reviewed. Then, in Sect. III, a summary of different entanglement criteria is given. Each of the presented criteria is related to a particular feature of entanglement. In Sect. IV a Bell-type inequality is given in terms of the Gaussian states properties. While in Sect. V a discussion on the effects of decoherence on states violating Bell inquality is presented. In Sect. VI we report an overview on some experimental results and, in particular, an *a posteriori* Bell test on an effective bipartite CV entangled state. Eventually, in Sect. VII conclusions are drawn.

II. GAUSSIAN STATES

A continuous-variable bi–partite GS is a two-mode state, on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_a \otimes \mathcal{H}_b$, whose characteristic function or, equivalently, Wigner function in phase space is Gaussian:

$$W(\mathbf{K}) = \frac{\exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{K}^T\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{K}\}}{2\pi\sqrt{Det[\sigma]}} \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{K} \equiv \left(X_{a,\vartheta},\ X_{a,\vartheta+\pi/2}, X_{\ b,\vartheta},\ X_{b,\vartheta+\pi/2}\right)$ is the vector of a set of orthogonal quadratures, for mode a and b respectively. (being $\widehat{X}_{k,\vartheta} \equiv \frac{\widehat{a}e^{i\vartheta}+\widehat{a}^\dagger e^{-i\vartheta}}{\sqrt{2}}$). We remind that the pair $\widehat{X}_0 = \widehat{X}$, and $\widehat{X}_{\pi/2} = \widehat{Y}$ ($[X_k, Y_k] = i$) associated to a single *e.m.* mode is the analogue to the position/momentum pair for a mechanical oscillator. This makes optical mode a good candidate for replicating EPR states in their original fashoin. All the features of GS are embedded in the second order momenta of the joint quadrature distribution, namely the covariance matrix[**?**] (CM) σ in Eq. (1). A pure GS can be seen as the action of a displacement and a squeezing operator onto the vacuum state. While, the most general mixed GS can be obtained replacing the vacuum with a thermal field at finite temperature.

For a bipartite state the σ is a 4×4 matrix, with elements $\sigma_{hk} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\langle\{K_k, K_h\}\rangle - \langle K_k\rangle\langle K_h\rangle$ (being $\{K_k, K_h\} \equiv K_kK_h + K_hK_k$ the anti–commutator). σ can be written in the form

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha} & \boldsymbol{\gamma} \\ \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top & \boldsymbol{\beta} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ represent self–correlation of the single subsystem and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ describes the cross correlation between the two subsystems. Remarkably, a GS represents any quantum system whose evolution can be described by a at least bilinear Bosonic Hamiltonian. In particular this is the case of optical parametric oscillators (OPO).

Any CM, representing a physical state, can be transformed into the so-called standard form [17]

$$\sigma_S = \begin{pmatrix} n & 0 & c_1 & 0 \\ 0 & n & 0 & c_2 \\ c_1 & 0 & m & 0 \\ 0 & c_2 & 0 & m \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

by means of local symplectic transformations[**?**] where n, m, c_1 and c_2 are determined by four local symplectic invariants $I_1 \equiv \det(\alpha) = n^2$, $I_2 \equiv \det(\beta) = m^2$, $I_3 \equiv \det(\gamma) = c_1c_2$, $I_4 \equiv \det(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = \left(nm - c_1^2\right)\left(nm - c_2^2\right)$. As a matter of fact, a sub–threshold type–II OPO, due to the symmetry of its Hamiltonian, can only produce states whose CM is a standard form [18]. Hereafter, whenever we refer to CMs we will mean such standard form. Moreover, at the time of birth inside the non–linear crystal, the bipartite state we would analyse in the following shows $n = m$ and $c_1 = -c_2 = c$.

From the symplectic invariants it is possible to give a criteria for disitnguishing among physical and non-physical CMs. $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ describes a physical state iff

$$I_1 + I_2 + 2I_3 \leq 4I_4 + \frac{1}{4}. \tag{4}$$

We also note that a pure GS is a minimum uncertainty state and that the CM relative to a pure state necessary has $\det(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = I_4 = 1/16$ so that for a pure state

$$c = \sqrt{n^2 - 1/4}. \tag{5}$$

while, for mixed symmetric states, $c < \sqrt{n^2 - 1/4}$. In general, for a bipatite GS, the purity reads

$$\mu(\sigma) = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{Det[\sigma]}}. \tag{6}$$

III. ENTANGLEMENT CRITERIA

A quantitative measure of entanglement for a mixed state is, so far, an unsolved issue. This is probably due to the different operational implications that different levels of quantum correlation open. At the same time, there exist different necessary and/or sufficient conditions to asses whether a given state is entangled or not. These criteria are easily translated into experimental tests for entanglement. Here we aim to look at the different criteria and connect them, logically, to the debate on the original EPR paper [2].

A. *Un–separability* criteria: PHS and Duan

The first criterion was developed by considering the definition of entangled states: a state of a composite system whose wavefunction cannot be given as product of sub-systems wavefunction. Or, in the case of mixed

states, following the Werner extension to the relative density matrix [14]. In the bi–partite case a density matrix represent a separable state iff its can be written as a convex combination of the tensor product of density operators relative to the two sub–systems

$$\rho = \sum_j p_j \rho_{j1} \otimes \rho_{j2}, \tag{7}$$

where $\sum_j p_j = 1$ while ρ_{ji} $i = 1, 2$ are the density matrices of subsystems 1 and 2. The criterion can be casted considering that if one performs a partial transposition (*i.e.* transposition of the density matrix with respect to only one of the two Hilbert subspaces) ρ transform into ρ_{PT} that, for a state written in form given in Eq. (7) will still represent a physical state of the composite system. Conversely, if the state un–separable, the tranformed density operator ρ_{PT} would have no more a physical counterpart. This criterion, is sometime referred to as the *ppt* criterion (*positivity* under *partial transposition*) or PHS from the names of the people that proposed it for discrete (Peres [19] and Horodecki [20]) and continuous variables (Simon [21]). Translated into the CM language a bi–partite Gaussian state is separable iff

$$n^2 + m^2 + 2\left|c_1 c_2\right| - 4\left(nm - c_1^2\right)\left(nm - c_2^2\right) \leq \frac{1}{4}\ , \tag{8}$$

and it is entangled otherwise. We also note that the PHS criterion is invariant under symplectic transformations and that for pure states the inequality is saturated.

The PHS criterion set, then, is roots into the fact that two systems that have interacted cannot, even if the split apart after the interaction, be described independently.

A second crierion, the Duan one [17], has been derived considering that in presence of an entangled state also the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, written for the joint system and a pair of EPR-like operators, has to take into account the inherent quantum correlation. The Duan criterion, a necessary condition for entanglement, for a CM in the usual standard form reads:

$$\sqrt{(2n-1)(2m-1)} - (c_1 - c_2) < 0\ . \tag{9}$$

Based on the calculation of the total variance of a pair of Einstein- Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) type operators. It relies on the fact that the inherent correlation reduces the total variance that, in separable states, is greater than the sum of the standard quantum limit applied to the single subsystem. In the case of frequency degenerate type–II OPO, this result in the squeezing of the modes obtained by letting the two entagled companions interfere [22].

B. The EPR "Reid" criterion

A stronger bound can be found by considering the original EPR *Gedankenexperiment* where the paradox was found in the possibility of determining the state of a far-away system by measuring its entangled companion. For this reason this criterion is usually indicated as the EPR criterion and was firstly introduced by Reid in 1989 [23], in the very early days of quantum information. It describes the ability to infer the expectation value of an observable on a sub–system by performing a suitable measurement on the second sub–system. This criterion sets only a sufficient condition for assessing entanglement being a stricter condition on the strenght of quantum correlation. It can be easily given in terms of CM elements:

$$n^2 \left(1 - \frac{c_1^2}{nm}\right)\left(1 - \frac{c_2^2}{nm}\right) < \frac{1}{4}\ . \tag{10}$$

While the criterion is asymmetric under the exchange of the two sub-systems so that the two definitions can make it ambiguous if one of the relations is not satisfied. This is not the case of balanced systems ($m = n$) where this one-side violation is not possible. The asymmetry of the criterion allows to use it for the so called steering capability: the state of a far away system can be steered by a suitable measurement on its entangled companion [24].

IV. BELL–LIKE INEQUALITY (NON–LOCALITY) IN PHASE SPACE

Generally, if we want to evaluate the non-locality of a state through a CHSH inequality [5], the operative form of the Bell one, we should build a Bell operator representing a combination of dichotomic (true-false) measurements. Then, if the expectation value of such a Bell operator violates the corresponding inequality, the system is not considered local, otherwise it would admit a classical description in terms of hidden variables. A parity operator is dichotomic. It can be constructed, on the photon number, for assigning $+1$ or -1 depending on whether an even or an odd number of photons has been registered. In Refs. [11, 25] a connection between the Wigner function of the state and the joint measurement of the parity operator performed on the bi–partite quantum state has been shown.

Here we want to give a handy expression that relates such a measurement to the CM of a generic GS. We consider the Bell operator in the form given in Eq. (7) of Ref. [11]. The Bell type function $\mathcal{B}$ is then, given by the linear combination of four expectation values

$$\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) \rangle + \left\langle \mathfrak{W}(\sqrt{\mathcal{I}}, \mathbf{0}) \right\rangle + \left\langle \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{0}, -\sqrt{\mathcal{I}}) \right\rangle - \left\langle \mathfrak{W}(\sqrt{\mathcal{I}}, -\sqrt{\mathcal{I}}) \right\rangle\ , \tag{11}$$

where

$$\langle \mathfrak{W}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \rangle \equiv \frac{\pi^2}{4} W(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)\ ; \tag{12}$$

with $W(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ the Wigner function of the state calculated in (α_1, α_2) and where α_k are complex amplitudes

(and so is $\sqrt{\mathcal{I}}$ is Eq. (11)). Local theories, admitting a description in terms of local hiddden variables, set the bound

$$|\mathcal{B}| \leq 2. \tag{13}$$

On one hand, any Bell inequality concerns the analysis of joint probabilities measured at space–time–separated locations. So that, to actually perform a Bell measure we should need to make repeated simultaneous measurements at different space–time–separated locations stochastically changing the detector settings (in this case the amounts of displacement). Then by statistical analysis we could conclude or not the violation of the CHSH type inequality.

On the other hand, Eq. (12) show that the knowledge of the Wigner function, i.e. the full reconstruction of the quantum state gives an insight to the local/non–local character of the state. Without running into delicate questions we wish to show that, being a GS fully described by a rather simple object, the CM, it is possible to evaluate, *a posteriori*, $\mathcal{B}$ on the state so to asses whether or not it is Bell correlated without the need of reconstructing the whole Wigner function. This paves the way to a handy experimental procedure to disciminate among different levels of quantum correlations.

A. Bipartite Gaussian state case

Now, we consider the bipartite GS generated by a type–II OPO described by the covariance matrix (3) σ, with $n = m$ and $c_1 = -c_2 = c$.

It can be esaily found that the quantity (11) becomes

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I}, n, c) = \frac{1 + 2\exp\left\{-\frac{n}{n^2-c^2}\mathcal{I}\right\} - \exp\left\{-\frac{n+c}{n^2-c^2}2\mathcal{I}\right\}}{4\left(n^2 - c^2\right)}. \tag{14}$$

The Bell function $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I}, n, c)$ depends on the state properties (n, c) and on a free parameter $(\mathcal{I})$. To look for the maximum violation for a given state we need to look for the value of the displacement amplitude $\mathcal{I}$ that nullifies the derivative $\frac{\partial \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I},n,c)}{\partial \mathcal{I}} = 0$. The maximum is, then, obtained for

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}(n, c) = \frac{n^2 - c^2}{n + 2c} \ln\left[\frac{n + c}{n}\right] \tag{15}$$

So that $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B}\big|_{\mathcal{I}=\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}}$ reads

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(n, c) = \frac{1}{4\left(n^2 - c^2\right)}\left[1 + 2\left(\frac{n + c}{n}\right)^{-\frac{n}{n+c}} - \left(\frac{n + c}{n}\right)^{-2\frac{n+c}{n+2c}}\right] \tag{16}$$

This gives the expectation value of the maximum value of the Bell operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ as a function of the Gaussian state parameters. So that, being possible to experimentally retrieve the CM of such a state [22], this formula can be used to perform an *a posteriori* test on the non–local property of the state.

Moreover, it is possible to relate $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ to the purity of the single subsystem $\mu_s \equiv \mu_a = \mu_b = 1/(2n)$. Having in mind the interconnection between entanglement and the purity of the constituent sub–systems [26], we have:

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\mu_s, C_{ab}) = \frac{\mu_s^2}{1 - C_{ab}^2}\left[1 + (1 + 2C_{ab})(1 + C_{ab})^{-2\frac{1+C_{ab}}{1+2C_{ab}}}\right] \tag{17}$$

where

$$C_{ab} \equiv \frac{\langle \Delta X_a X_b \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle \Delta X_a^2 \rangle \langle \Delta X_b^2 \rangle}} = \frac{c}{n} \tag{18}$$

is the correlation coefficient whose limit for a pure state is $C_{ab}^2 = 1 - 1/(4n^2) = 1 - \mu_s^2$

It can also be proved that, when the Gaussian state is pure, $\mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}}$ can be considered an entanglement witness: any entangled state violates the Bell inequality and viceversa.

B. Purity, entanglement and non-locality

For mixed states the above equivalence does not hold. Given a mixed system, one has $\mu_s^2 < 1 - C_{ab}^2$. So that, for a given correlation coefficient C_{ab}, it is possible to set three boundaries for the values of μ_s

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_D &= 1 - C_{ab}, \\ \mu_B &= \left[\frac{2\left(1 - C_{ab}^2\right)}{1 + (1 + 2C_{ab})(1 + C_{ab})^{-2\frac{1+C_{ab}}{1+2C_{ab}}}}\right]^{1/2}, \\ \mu_P &= \left[1 - C_{ab}^2\right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

so that $\mu_s < \mu_D$ denotes separable states, $\mu_D < \mu_s < \mu_B$ indicates entangled states that do not violate the Bell inequality, and, finally, for $\mu_B < \mu_s < \mu_P$ the states are entangled and violate the Bell inequality. For $\mu_s > \mu_P$ the relative CM would be not physical. In this way it is possible to distinguish three (physical) regions in the plane (μ_s, C_{ab}) (see Fig. 1)

Region I**):** Separable states compatible with the local hidden variables theory $(\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\mu_s, C_{ab}) < 2)$.

Region II**):** Entangled states compatible with the local hidden variables theory $(\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\mu_s, C_{ab}) < 2)$.

Region III**):** Entangled states not compatible with the local hidden variables theory $(\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\mu_s, C_{ab}) > 2)$.

It is clear that there aren't separable GS that violate the Bell's inequality. Instead, a state compatible with a local theory (*i.e.* compatible with a theory in hidden variables) can also be entangled. This confirms the existence of different forms of quantum correlations and non–locality.



FIG. 1. Region plot of $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ as function of purity μ_s and the correlation coefficient C_{ab}. For the different meanings of the plor regions see text.

V. GAUSSIAN NOISE DOES NOT BREAK THE ENTANGLEMENT, BUT IT BREAKS THE BELL'S NONLOCALITY

In this Section we want to analyze the behaviour of the Bell's nonlocality subjected to passive Gaussian noise. We will see that when a pure ($c = \sqrt{n^2 - 1/4}$), entangled and Bell's non–local (i.e.$\mathcal{B}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}} > 2$) state evolves through a Gaussian channel, retains its entanglement, but looses its Bell's nonlocality. This means that although, at the time of its birth, the state is pure, so that it violates Bell's inequality and breaks the Duan bound, decoherence highlights the different nature of the two markers: the Gaussian state becomes local (in according to Bell), i.e. it would admit a description in terms of local hidden variables, although it remains entangled.

A bipartite state, described by the CM Eq. (3), subjected to the action of a passive Gaussian channel, undergoes a transformation such that: [18]

$$\begin{aligned} n_T &= \frac{1-T}{2} + T n_1, \\ c_T &= T c_1, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where n_1 and c_1 are the CM elements of the initial pure state and T is the trasmittivity of a fictituous beam splitter mimecking a lossy transmission [27].

We can calculate the evolution of the Bell function $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(n_1, c_1)$ (16) starting from an initially pure state, described by the CM elements n_1 and c_1 and analyzing $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(n_T, c_T)$ as a function of the coefficient of transmissivity T ($0 < T < 1$). So the Bell's function $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ becomes a function $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_T$ depending on the initial (pure) state and transmissivity T of the channel. The relative expression, ideed rather long and complicate, will be used for evaluating the correspondence among experimental results and theory in the next section.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In a recent paper (see Ref. [18]) we have analysed how different entanglement and quantum signatures evolves under decoherence. In this paper we wish to include the experimental analysis of the non–local character under decoherence. We have to stress that, in view of the restrict region ($T > 90\%$) where one could expect a Bell inequality violation, we have not observed any Bell inequality violation. This is essentially due to the maximum overall transmission we can get from the OPO cavity to the homodyne detector (63%). Moreover, we stress that this is rather an a posteriori check of the non-local character of the state than a Bell measure.

The analysed state is the one outing a sub–threshold type–II OPO [28]. The block scheme of the experiment is given in Fig. 2. The full covariance matrix is retrieved by a single homodyne detector [29] following the procedure described in details in Ref. [30].



FIG. 2. Schematic representation of the experimental setup. The generation stage is a type–II OPO operating below the oscillation threshold. At the OPO output a neutral adsorber mimicks the transmission over a real channel. The state is reconstructed exploiting data collected by a single homodyne detector.

In Fig. 3 we have plotted the experimental value obtained for $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_T$. The continuous line represent the theoretical expections for the pure ancestor state.

As it can be seen experimental data are in good agreement with the expected evolution.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Different bounds have been, so far, discussed in the literature for discriminating continuous variable separable and entangled states. Each of them looks at slightly different facets of the EPR paradox. So that, in this paper, they are presented in connection to the original EPR arguments.

Moreover, for the first time, we express by a handy and direct formula a Bell–type inequaly, written for CV



FIG. 3. Experimental evolution of the Bell's function vs. T, the transmittivity of a variable absorber mimicking a realistic transmission channel.

states, in terms of the covariance matrix of a Gaussian state. We discuss its relation with the purity of the entangled sub-systems and analyse, also experimentaly, its behaviour under decoherence. So doing we have proved, experimentally, that, also in CV regime, there exists mixed entangled states that do not violate the Bell inequality. While, for pure states, any entangled state is Bell non–local.

REFERENCES

[1] E. Schrödinger. Discussion of probability relations between separated systems. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 31:555–563, 9 1935.

[2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen. Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Phys. Rev.*, 47:777, 1935.

[3] D. Bohm and Y. Aharonov. Discussion of experimental proof for the paradox of einstein, rosen, and podolsky. *Phys. Rev.*, 108:1070–1076, Nov 1957.

[4] J.S. Bell. On the einstein podolsky rosen paradox. *Physics*, 1:195–200, 1964.

[5] John F. Clauser, Michael A. Horne, Abner Shimony, and Richard A. Holt. Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 23:880–884, Oct 1969.

[6] Ryszard Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, Michał Horodecki, and Karol Horodecki. Quantum entanglement. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 81:865–942, Jun 2009.

[7] Marissa Giustina, Alexandra Mech, Sven Ramelow, Bernhard Wittmann, Johannes Kofler, Joern Beyer, Adriana Lita, Brice Calkins, Thomas Gerrits, SaeWoo Nam, Rupert Ursin, and Anton Zeilinger. Bell violation using entangled photons without the fair-sampling assumption. *NATURE*, 497(7448):227–230, MAY 9 2013.

[8] M. D. Reid and D. F. Walls. Violations of classical inequalities in quantum optics. *Phys. Rev. A*, 34:1260–1276, Aug 1986.

[9] Z. Y. Ou, S. F. Pereira, H. J. Kimble, and K. C. Peng. Realization of the einstein-podolsky-rosen paradox for continuous variables. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 68:3663–3666, Jun 1992.

[10] Samuel L. Braunstein and Peter van Loock. Quantum information with continuous variables. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 77:513–577, Jun 2005.

[11] Konrad Banaszek and Krzysztof Wódkiewicz. Nonlocality of the einstein-podolsky-rosen state in the wigner representation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 58:4345–4347, Dec 1998.

[12] H. M. Wiseman, S. J. Jones, and A. C. Doherty. Steering, entanglement, nonlocality, and the einstein-podolsky-rosen paradox. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 98:140402, Apr 2007.

[13] D. Cavalcanti, F. G. S. L. Brandão, and M. O. Terra Cunha. Are all maximally entangled states pure? *Phys. Rev. A*, 72:040303, Oct 2005.

[14] Reinhard F. Werner. Quantum states with einstein-podolsky-rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model. *Phys. Rev. A*, 40:4277–4281, Oct 1989.

[15] Christian Weedbrook, Stefano Pirandola, Raúl Garcìa-Patrón, Nicolas J. Cerf, Timothy C. Ralph, Jeffrey H. Shapiro, and Seth Lloyd. Gaussian quantum information. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 84:621–669, May 2012.

[16] S. Olivares. Quantum optics in the phase space. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 203(1):3–24, 2012.

[17] Lu-Ming Duan, G. Giedke, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller. Inseparability criterion for continuous variable systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 84:2722–2725, Mar 2000.

[18] D. Buono, G. Nocerino, A. Porzio, and S. Solimeno. Experimental analysis of decoherence in continuous-variable bipartite systems. *Phys. Rev. A*, 86:042308, Oct 2012.

[19] Asher Peres. Separability criterion for density matrices. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 77:1413–1415, Aug 1996.

[20] Pawel Horodecki. Separability criterion and inseparable mixed states with positive partial transposition. *Physics Letters A*, 232(5):333 – 339, 1997.

[21] R. Simon. Peres-horodecki separability criterion for continuous variable systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 84:2726–2729, Mar 2000.

[22] V. D'Auria, S. Fornaro, A. Porzio, S. Solimeno, S. Olivares, and M. G. A. Paris. Full characterization of gaussian bipartite entangled states by a single homodyne detector. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 102:020502, Jan 2009.

[23] M. Reid and P.D. Drummond. Demonstration of the Einstein–Podolsky–Rosen paradox using nondegenerate parametric amplification. *Phys. Rev. A*, 40:913, 1989.

[24] Vitus Händchen, Tobias Eberle, Sebastian Steinlechner, Aiko Samblowski, Torsten Franz, Reinhard F. Werner, and Roman Schnabel. Observation of one-way einstein-podolsky-rosen steering. *Nature Photonics*, 6:596–599, 2012.

[25] Konrad Banaszek and Krzysztof Wódkiewicz. Testing

quantum nonlocality in phase space. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 82:2009–2013, Mar 1999.

[26] Gerardo Adesso, Alessio Serafini, and Fabrizio Illuminati. Determination of continuous variable entanglement by purity measurements. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 92:087901, Feb 2004.

[27] V. D'Auria, C. de Lisio, A. Porzio, S. Solimeno, and Matteo G.A. Paris. Transmittivity measurements by means of squeezed vacuum light. *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics*, 39(5):1187–1198, 2006.

[28] V. D'Auria, S. Fornaro, A. Porzio, E.A. Sete, and S. Solimeno. Fine tuning of a triply resonant opo for generating frequency degenerate cv entangled beams at low pump powers. *Applied Physics B*, 91:309–314, 2008.

[29] Virginia D'Auria, Alberto Porzio, Salvatore Solimeno, Stefano Olivares, and Matteo G.A. Paris. Characterization of bipartite states using a single homodyne detector. *Journal of Optics B: Quantum and Semiclassical Optics*, 7(12):S750, 2005.

[30] D. Buono, G. Nocerino, V. D'Auria, A. Porzio, S. Olivares, and M. G. A. Paris. Quantum characterization of bipartite gaussian states. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B*, 27(6):A110–A118, Jun 2010.